

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4 to 45, 47, 48, and 85 are in the application, of which Claims 1 and 85 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4 to 45, 47, 48, and 85 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,793,723 (Auslander). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to a feature of the invention as recited by Claims 1 and 85, the fluorescent ink comprises first and second organic compounds which are incompatible with each other.

The Office Action concedes that Auslander does not explicitly disclose the above-discussed feature. Nevertheless, the Office Action takes the position that this feature would have been obvious. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants respectfully submit that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited document that would lead one skilled in the art to arrive at the above-discussed feature.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from the independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

In any event, Auslander is not prior art to the subject application by virtue of the filing dates of the following foreign priority applications: Japan 2000-240314, filed


August 8, 2000; Japan 2000-240492, filed August 8, 2000; Japan 2000-354169, filed November 21, 2000; and Japan 2000-354185, filed November 21, 2000. Sworn translations of these applications are being submitted herewith. Sworn translations of foreign priority applications Japan 2001-232792, filed July 31, 2001, and Japan 2001-232931, filed July 31, 2001 are also being submitted. In accordance with MPEP § 201.15, the Examiner is respectfully requested to confirm for herself that Applicants are entitled to their priority date, and upon such confirmation, to remove Auslander as a reference against the subject application.

Claims 1, 2, 4 to 36, and 85 were also rejected for obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 1 to 3, 6, and 10 to 36 of U.S. Patent No. 6,835,239 (Hakamada), which rejection is respectfully traversed. The Office Action indicates that the double patenting rejection may be overcome by filing a Terminal Disclaimer. If the double patenting rejection is maintained and is the only remaining issue, Applicants will consider the possibility of filing a Terminal Disclaimer.

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to
our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Damond E. Vadnais
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 52,310

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 119180v1